

SOUTHERN STANDARD.

VOLUME II.

COLUMBUS, LOWNDES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, OCTOBER 2, 1852.

NUMBER 36.

The Southern Standard

IS ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY
CHAPMAN & SMITH,
At three dollars per annum, in advance.

Advertisements—First insertion (ten lines or less) \$1.00; for each subsequent insertion 50 cents. The number of insertions must be specified on the face of the copy furnished; and will be published until ordered and charged as above. All articles of a personal character will be charged double the above rates—each in advance when submitted. Political editorials or public addresses for the benefit of individuals will be charged as advertisements. On private advertisements a liberal discount will be made. The privilege of yearly advertisements in by them embracing other matter, will be charged for by the square. Letters on business connected with the office must be sent to the office.

COLUMBUS:

Wednesday Morning, Sept. 29, 1852.

More Whig Testimony.

The Hon. Daniel Jenifer, of Maryland, and recently a Whig member of Congress from that State, thus writes to a friend. It may be proper to say that Mr. Jenifer was one of the most prominent, as he was one of the most able whigs during his day, in Congress. He was not only an early, but he was one of the ablest champions of Clay's American Home Protection policy in Congress, or out of it. He was a man of great political influence and personal worth, and possessed the confidence of the great Kentuckian.

PORT TOWNSHIP, Md., August 10, 1852.
My Dear Sir: Yours of the 6th inst. is about the fifteenth letter I have received of similar import, desiring to know "whether it is my intention to support the nomination of the late Whig National Convention for President, &c." Immediately after the adjournment of that Convention, I addressed a letter to the President of the Convention, stating the reasons why I could not concur in support that nomination. That letter was delayed being sent as directed, from deference to the opinions and wishes of friends for whom I entertain a high regard. Finding from your and other letters that my silence had been misinterpreted, and that I cannot remain in quiet retirement without being subjected to unjust animadversions, I will frankly tell what are my opinions. Allow me here to premise that there are many, very many, who agree with me in opinion, who are restrained from expressing it from the delicacy of their position, having been members of the Whig National Convention, members of Congress, and others representing a Whig constituency.

The National Whig Convention having nominated a candidate for the Presidency to whom I am not, with the opinions I entertain, consistently give my support, it is due to myself, to you, and to the friends with whom I have so long acted, to assign, briefly, the reasons which induce me to differ from you and from them. I need not say to you, or any other of my political friends, that I have ever been a consistent Whig, (not an ultra one,) and upon all occasions, when principle was not involved, have yielded my personal preferences to the better judgment of the majority.

In every Presidential election since 1828, I have gone with my friends in support of the nominee, though not of my own choice. From that period I have been an ardent, devoted friend to Henry Clay, and preferred him to all others; still I gave a zealous support to General Harrison, and to General Taylor; in doing which there was no sacrifice of principle; it was a preference of men, meeting upon and entertaining similar principles. Their opinions had been expressed, and were known prior to their nomination, to be in accordance with the views of those who nominated them.

Long prior to the meeting of the National Convention in June last, it was well understood that no candidate would receive the support of the South, unless his opinions were known to be in favor of the compromise measures, including the Fugitive Slave Law, as a final settlement of those absorbing questions.

Discarding all sectional preferences, the South presented no Southern candidate for the Presidency. The opinions of every man, who was looked to as a candidate for that distinguished station, were known, *sane*. Those of Mr. Webster and Mr. Fillmore, were expressed and recorded, forming the basis of the platform for which they had been denounced, and, as far as fanaticism could affect it, sacrificed. Not so with Gen. Scott, his position precluded him from entering into the contests of the day, then shaking the Union to its centre. His opinions upon those questions were not known—they were anxiously desired and looked for. Some of his friends, who had access to him, expressed their confidence in the soundness of his views upon the compromise and Fugitive Slave Laws. His claims were zealously urged by friends from the South and from the North; the latter of whom looked upon him as the available candidate to defeat Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Webster in the Convention, by which they would have the sanction of the Whig National Convention in furtherance of their views hereafter. Hence doubts arose as to the course Gen. Scott would pursue in regard to those measures in the event of his nomination and election. His continued silence upon the only question where his views were desired, (however pure his motives,) augmented those doubts, which, upon the meeting of the Convention, rose to distrust. The course pursued by his friends in the Convention was not calculated to do away those unfavorable impressions.

Had Gen. Scott, before the meeting of the Convention, come out with the frankness of a soldier, as was expected of him, and made known his opinions, he would have thrown off the incubus which oppresses him; he would have cleared himself from the noxious vapors which surround him, would have added to his gallant military career from Lundy's Lane to the gulf of Mexico, by which he has won for himself and his country, imperishable laurels, and he might have received the support of the Union Whigs throughout the country. By adopting a different course he has lost that of many who would have given him a generous support though not their first choice.

His nomination has given encouragement to the Free Soilers and Abolitionists, and his election would complete their triumph. The proceedings of the convention show this state of things. The platform was adopted with sixty-six members recording their votes against it, whilst others who voted for it, did not consider themselves bound by it. During fifty ballots for a Presidential candidate, not one Southern State voted for Gen. Scott, and he was ultimately nominated by New Hampshire, Vermont and Illinois—all non-slaveholding States—casting their votes for him. With these facts, should Gen. Scott be elected President, with a knowledge that he will be indebted exclusively for his nomination and election to those friends, can any man doubt that Gen. Scott as a high-minded honorable man, will feel bound as far as in his power, to administer to the views and wishes

of those who will have placed him in that exalted station?

The object and delight of the Free Soilers and Abolitionists, were to break down Mr. Webster and Mr. Fillmore, because they had advocated and carried into effect the provisions of the Compromise Law. They united upon Gen. Scott to accomplish that object. Those who voted against the platform, still voted for Gen. Scott, and his acceptance of it, has made no change in their views. Hence it is clear that they have expectations from his election, which may or may not be realized. It is deeply to be regretted, that he who has gained for himself so enviable a fame by his gallant deeds in war, and also rendered civil services, should now be placed in a distrustful position. Under all the circumstances, I look upon the nomination of General Scott as unfortunate for himself, unfortunate for the Whig party, and should be elected, unfortunate for the country. Entertaining these views, I should be unworthy the generous confidence of my friends if I suppressed the expression of them—although I am aware in doing so, I subject myself to the attacks of those who, loving party more than principle, consider it a virtue to denounce every man who has the temerity to avow opinions contrary to theirs.

Political party ties of long standing are amongst the strongest which bind men together, and most difficult to be disavowed. No man feels this more than I do. Having received so many evidences of confidence from my political friends, to whom I am so much indebted, it is with deep regret I find myself compelled to differ with them now. I would greatly have preferred remaining silent; but I have no alternative—either to be misrepresented or to speak out—and you well know that it has been my habit, since I first took part in public affairs, when properly called on, to express my opinion of political men and measures, regardless of consequences. All I ask is, that you and other friends will extend to me the same charity for my opinions that you have a right to expect for your own.

Truly yours,
DANIEL JENIFER.

Speech of Hon. R. H. Stanton,
OF KENTUCKY.

THE HOUSE being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—
Mr. Stanton said: I acknowledge my indebtedness to the courtesy of my friend from Tennessee, [Mr. Polk,] for permission to occupy a portion of his time. My object is to direct the attention of the country to the very dispiriting manner in which the friends of General Scott are conducting the canvass against General Pierce. I shall state facts—indisputable facts—which no gentleman can evade or invalidate. The grand and mighty of the system of electioneering adopted by those who have in their keeping the interests of General Scott, will require no comments from me. The facts themselves are sufficiently illustrative of the turpitude of the system.

On the 17th day of June last, immediately after the nomination of General Pierce by the National Democratic Convention, the National Review of this city, an Abolition paper, known and recognized over the Union as the central organ of that fanatical party, commenced its warfare upon General Pierce. On that day it contained a long article, occupying several columns of the paper, reviewing the votes of General Pierce, while a member of the Senate and House of Representatives, on the subject of slavery, and giving such exhibition of each vote as was necessary to exhibit him in the light of a warm and ardent advocate of Southern interests. The whole purpose of the article, as appears from its own language, was to show that General Pierce, in his whole official career, stood opposed to the Abolitionists, and was in favor of maintaining the constitutional rights of the South—in other words, that he was an ultra pro-slavery man. This Abolition article, after referring to the votes of General Pierce, copies his letter to Major Lally, of the 27th of May last, an article from the Richmond Examiner, and an extract from the speech of the Hon. Mr. Orr, of South Carolina, to show that he has been always opposed to the fanaticism of the North, and occupied a position satisfactory to Southern men. It then closes with an appeal to the Free-Soil sentiment of the North, not to give countenance or support to General Pierce or the platform upon which he was nominated. Here are the concluding paragraphs of this document:

"Once more we appeal to our free-soil democratic friends not committed to the nomination. You now know the antecedents of the candidate, and his present position. On the paramount question he is, and always has been, directly and violently opposed to you. You know the platform—no slavery can explain away the fact that it was a fanatical convention. You know that Mr. Pierce insisted upon the adoption of the offensive features which characterize it; that he fully represents it; that his success will be the ratification of that platform by the democracy of the United States. It contains no word in favor of reform, no word in favor of placing the government of the United States in a foreign relations and negotiations, on the side of the democratic principle in Europe—no word in favor of just protection to the river and lake commerce of the west—a commerce more valuable than all our foreign trade; but, with a single exception, it refers to old issues which either have been settled, or no longer constitute questions between the two parties; and the exception—the only new article in the platform—is adverse to all your convictions, abhorrent to all your sympathies."

"Of what principle, in what way, by what device of reason or sophistry, can you justify to yourselves, or to others, the support of such a platform—such a nomination? Is a man bound to go with his party, right or wrong? Can he not refuse, openly and manfully, to support it when it does wrong—when it calls upon him to vote on a wrong issue—and go with it when it does right? We care nothing about third parties, but in certain crises, movements by party men, independently of their party, or in opposition to it, are demanded by conscience, consistency, true manhood, the best interests of the country. And at such times personal hazards must be braved. The man must make up his mind to die, politically, rather than die morally."

This document, designed to arouse the Free-Soil sentiment of the North against General Pierce, and originating with the Abolition paper in this city, has been republished in pamphlet form, and at this moment is being circulated by the Whig Executive Committee, and the friends of General Scott, in every State where slavery does not exist. The Whig Executive Committee, which was created by the Whig National Convention, to superintend the canvass, have had immense numbers of this document printed and circulated. While a document of this character is being circulated in the Northern States, to render General Pierce odious as a friend of the South, in my own State odious as a friend of the South, the most shameful misrepresentations of his New Boston speech, is held up to public odium as an Abolitionist. I have seen in the newspapers, accounts of the manner in which the friends of General Scott in Kentucky, and other slave States, are using the Abolition misrepresentations of that speech to prejudice the public mind against the Democratic nominee. But this is not all. This same Executive Whig Committee, of which the Hon. Truman Smith, of Connecticut, is at the head, have published for circulation in the slave States, a document entitled "General Pierce and his Abolition allies," the most remarkable document to which the present canvass has given existence, and the purpose of which is, to prove that General Pierce has been a uniform Abolitionist. This document is not designed for circulation in the North—it is not suited to that latitude. It is manufactured for Southern consumption and does General Pierce, as every enlightened man knows, the grossest injustice and wrong. Up to this time it has not been sent to the friends of the House of Representatives, to be developed and delivered to the members of the House who, as all others from the work of circulating them, as all others from the Whig Committee have been, but are folded, I understand, in rooms engaged down in the city, and sent off without reaching the Capitol. I will not ask why this precaution has been taken. The fact speaks trumpet-tongued for itself. I have examined this document, and well for the Whig committee they have not allowed it to come to the Capitol. It begins with a vote given by General Pierce while a member of the House of Representatives, against allowing Edmund Brooke, of Georgetown, in this District, to import two negro slaves into the District, against the then existing laws, and winds up with a rebuke of the Abolition misrepresentation of his New Boston speech. It is interspersed throughout with comments and assertions, conveying the idea that he is an Abolitionist, as deeply dyed in the fanatical tenets of that party as Giddings, Phillips, or Garrison. I will now give a few of these extracts, that the character of the document, and the purpose, it is designed to subserve, may be seen.

"We do not hesitate to affirm, in the broadest terms, General Franklin Pierce did, at New Boston, on the 24 of January, assert in a public assembly that he considered slavery 'contrary to moral rights'; that he 'loathed the fugitive slave law'; and that he had 'a most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave'; and we consider the attempts of himself and friends at evasion, and his own half-demi, fatal to his character as a frank, sincere man."

"But there are colored facts and considerations which tend powerfully to sustain the accuracy of Mr. Ross, and to show the truth of his allegations. From the matter herebefore inserted it appears that General Pierce, Norris, Hubbard, Fessenden, Ayer, and Campbell are all of the idea that Mr. Foss can be discredited at the South by a mere allegation of abolitionism or free-soilism, and they seem to roll up their eyes in holy horror at the presumption of the person in charging on the General the expression of anti-slavery feelings and views. One would suppose, from the tenor and drift of their communications for the public, that the New Hampshire democracy had been, during the whole of the fearful struggle through which the country has recently passed, the party of all that is moderate, just, reasonable, and truly national on the topics in issue, and that, in taking a position on the constitution, and in maintaining that position, they in fact had leaned over considerably towards the South. But unhappily for them, and particularly for General Pierce, the records of their proceedings, both in conventions and legislative assemblies, disclose a very different state of things. We undertake to prove that the democracy of the Granite State, with General Pierce at their head, have pursued an extreme course on these subjects, and have in fact been the ring-leaders of all the fanaticism and agitation which have been going on in New England for several years past."

In order to show General Pierce to be an Abolitionist, it is necessary to attack the whole body of the New Hampshire Democracy, and hence, they are denounced as 'the ring-leaders in all the fanaticism and agitation which have been going on in New England for several years past.' But here is an extract equally as unjust and ridiculous:

"We insist that Franklin Pierce is thoroughly imbued with anti-slavery sentiment and prejudice, and that he will, before the South, and all its vast interests, as readily as Martin Van Buren did."

"The democratic party of New Hampshire, having been involved at the election of 1851, in a very serious embarrassment, by reason of a controversy with Rev. Mr. Atwood, (the General P.) went on the 24 of January to New Boston, into the midst of an Atwood community, to win back some of the lost sheep to the democratic fold."

On appearing before his audience, with his heart full of the sentiment that 'slavery is a great social, moral, and political evil,' he draws on his solemn northern face, and takes into his hands his northern system, and displays it to the gaping multitude. After appropriate preliminaries, the orator waxes warm, and being confident that the South would not hear, he bursts out with fervid accents—'I loathe the fugitive slave law. I have a most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave; the law is opposed to humanity—yes, it is opposed to moral right.'

"What sort of an excruciating word Franklin Pierce makes of this fugitive slave law? What sort of a guardian of the rights and institutions of the South? Who would surround him in the event of his elevation to the Presidency? Who would shape his policy and direct his councils?"

I can answer this last interrogatory and say that it would not be William H. Seward, nor any man of similar sentiments. But, the closing paragraph from this remarkable document, caps the climax of impudence and fraud:

"Must it not be mortifying to the last degree to every true-hearted American to have such a man as Franklin Pierce seriously pressed on the country as a candidate for the presidency? Is it not more mortifying to have one occupying such a situation degraded so low as to be obliged to back himself up by the certificates and statements of the lowest and basest of mankind? With what loathing and disgust will every well-regulated mind turn away from the miserable exhibition which he makes of himself, by figuring in the newspapers with a letter which is destitute of every characteristic that constitutes an emanation of frankness, sincerity and honor."

ded to make more emphatic and impressive the denunciation of General Pierce, as the *woolly-headed candidate*. Well, the Whig executive committee is welcome to all the capital they can make for General Scott by such means of political warfare.

Sir, what can the high-minded and honorable people, North and South, think of such a system of electioneering. Here are two documents—one published to be circulated in the North, the other in the South—one representing the Democratic candidate for the Presidency as a pro-slavery man and friend of the South, the other showing him up as an Abolitionist, opposed to slavery and the South, and both emanating from the same executive committee, and circulated by members of the same party.

For one, sir, if my party were capable of such fraud and duplicity, I should cease to co-operate with it in any effort to elect its nominee. I would not pander to such a purpose, not trifle with the credulity of the public in such a manner. I am authorized to say, and I here affirm without fear of contradiction, that the Executive Committee of the democratic party have published no document during the present canvass which has been designed or was adopted to circulate in one section of the Union more than another. They have neither published nor circulated any document which was not as applicable to Massachusetts as to Mississippi, and which might not, with perfect propriety, have been sent into any and every State of the Union.

Sir, I have a list of all the documents which have ever been published by that committee and circulated, and I give the title of each, that all may know their character. There is no assault upon General Scott, showing him to be one thing in one section of the Union, and the very reverse in another. They are all national documents, and answer as well for the North as the Southern latitude. Here they are:

The Proceedings of the National Democratic Convention.
The Life of Pierce and King.
The Galphin Fraud.
Vindication of Pierce by his Fellow-Officers.
Exposure of the Catholic Test-Slander.
Whig Testimony against General Scott.
Scott's Political Writings Reviewed.
Exposure of the Abolition Attack upon General Pierce (circulated by the whig committee).
German Life of Pierce and King.
Better of General Shields.
Hon. Mr. Gentry's speech.
Hon. Mr. Tompkins' speech.
Hon. Mr. Cabell's speech.
Correspondence between Scott and Marcy.
General Exposure of Scott's Original Native Americanism.

Sir, these are the documents which, up to this time have been published by the democratic Executive Committee, and none of them have been published at the National Executive office, or the office of any other *disunion* paper.

I have been to the folding-room of the House, I have examined the books of the office, having charge of that department, (which are equally accessible to all the members,) and find that the pamphlet entitled "A BARE CHARTER IN THE LIFE OF GENERAL FRANKLIN PIERCE," has been sent to the members of this house, whose names I shall read, in numbers as follows:

July 10th, Hon. E. Newton, Ohio.	2,000
July 10th, Hon. O. Fowler, Massachusetts.	1,000
July 10th, Hon. S. W. Parker, Indiana.	2,000
July 10th, Hon. L. D. Campbell, Ohio.	2,000
July 10th, Hon. J. W. Howe, Pennsylvania.	2,000
July 20th, Hon. S. W. Parker, Indiana.	1,000
July 20th, Hon. J. W. Howe, Pennsylvania.	2,000
July 20th, Hon. L. D. Campbell, Ohio.	500
July 20th, Hon. L. Washburn, Maine.	1,000
July 20th, Hon. W. A. Sackett, New York.	1,000
July 23d, Hon. A. Tuck, New Hampshire.	1,000
July 23d, Hon. J. Allison, Pennsylvania.	1,000
July 23d, Hon. B. Stanton, Ohio.	1,000
July 23d, Hon. R. Yates, Illinois.	1,000
July 23d, Hon. J. Z. Goodrich, Mass.	1,000
July 30th, Hon. E. Newton, Ohio.	1,000
Aug. 2d, Hon. J. L. Schoaffert, N. Y.	2,000
Aug. 2d, Hon. L. Washburn, Maine.	1,000
Aug. 2d, Hon. A. Tuck, N. H.	1,000
Aug. 2d, Hon. J. Perkins, N. H.	1,000
Aug. 5th, Hon. E. Newton, Ohio.	1,000
Aug. 5th, Hon. A. P. Hascall, N. Y.	1,000
Aug. 5th, Hon. H. S. Walbridge, N. Y.	1,000
Aug. 7th, Hon. J. Z. Goodrich, Mass.	1,000
Aug. 7th, Hon. Z. Sander, Mass.	1,000
Aug. 8th, Hon. J. Horsford, N. Y.	1,000
Aug. 8th, Hon. J. Wells, N. Y.	1,000
Aug. 9th, Hon. L. D. Campbell, Ohio.	1,000

(for Iowa).

Aug. 13th, Hon. S. W. Parker, Indiana.	500
Aug. 20th, Hon. O. Fowler, Mass.	12,000
Aug. 21st, Hon. J. H. Duncan, Mass.	1,000

It will be seen that the circulation of this document by Northern members of this house, commenced on the 10th of July, and from that period to the 21st of the present month, nearly 50,000 copies of it have been folded at the public's expense, and circulated under the frank of the gentleman named. How many have been circulated by the whig committee, and General Scott's friends in the Senate, I have no means of ascertaining. [The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Fowler] had twelve thousand sent to him alone on the 20th inst., last Saturday. These gentlemen whose names I have read, it will be observed, are all from the Northern states, and their sentiments on the subject of slavery are well known. The pamphlet was published at the Era office, and I presume paid for by the Executive committee of the whigs.

Mr. Fowler, I here affirm that no order has been given for these twelve thousand copies. It has been given to the folding-room, it has been without my knowledge, and without my approbation. The one thousand first spoken of, I received, and franked off. [Laughter.]

Mr. Stanton. The gentleman admits the truth of what I say. Will he tell me how many he franked, and if, before allusion was made to them here, he did not know that another large supply for him was in the hands of the folders to be delivered? Mr. Fowler. The thousand spoken of, I received some time ago, and franked them. [Laughter.] I have sent them off believing that they tell the truth, and are valuable. I have heard within a day or two, that twelve thousand more were there. I heard it from yourself.

Mr. Stanton. Yes, I told you. I believe they do tell the truth when they represent Gen. Pierce as a friend of the constitutional rights of the South, but they contradict what is said in the pamphlet called "General Pierce and his Abolition allies." Mr. Fowler. I did not order them. I have not been requested by any member of this house to receive them, nor did I know, until informed by the gentleman from Kentucky, they were in the folding-room.

Mr. Stanton. What have you done with them? Is it not your intention to frank, and send them out, as you did the others you received?

The Raleigh Standard has been requested by a gentleman in Warren county to offer the following

proposition: He proposes to bet \$1000 that Gen. Scott will not be elected—\$1000 that North Carolina will not vote for him—\$1000 that he will not get twelve States—and \$1000 that seven States cannot be named that he will get; the bets to be taken altogether as one cut.

One of the Anti-Slavery papers holds the following language in reply to the Washington Union. The editor is bitterly opposed to Pierce and King:

We are determined fully to expose the outrageous falsification of the relative positions of the Slave Power and its organized opponents, so common in the columns of the Union and its affiliated prints. We seek no alliance with Federalism—we abhor it; but we do seek to break up the league formed between Federalism and Slavery-Fanaticism. Slavery, we assert, is a system, existing only under State authority, within State jurisdiction, in virtue of State laws. The Federal Constitution carefully excludes the idea of property in human beings, and contains no grant of power to the Federal Government, to create, recognize, sustain, or to legislate in behalf of Slavery. The laws sustaining it in the District of Columbia, regulating the coastwise slave trade, and making provisions for the reclamation of fugitive slaves, find no warrant in the Constitution, and are the offspring of the league between Slavery and Federalism. For the same reason, if there be Slavery in New Mexico and Utah, it is in violation of the Constitution. We seek to denationalize Slavery—to decentralize it—to divorce the Federal Government totally from its support—to turn it over to the States in which it exists, and to establish within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Constitution, the Law of personal Freedom. The accomplishment of this work will be the triumph of the Democratic idea and of the doctrine of State Rights over Federalism.

It is useless to keep up the game of misrepresentation—to continue to impute to us a secret purpose to use the Supreme Judiciary or the Federal Government to abolish Slavery in the States. People are every day becoming convinced of the charge. It is one thing to relieve the Nation or Union from the responsibility of maintaining Slavery, and quite another to impose on it the responsibility of abolishing Slavery in the States. The former act is constitutional, legitimate, and a high duty; the latter is not constitutional, not legitimate, not a duty. The States in which Slavery exists must determine each for itself how to rid itself of the evil, under its responsibilities to God and to that Public Opinion from whose imperious demands neither the Despotism of the Throne nor that of the Plantation can release itself.

The Washington correspondent of the Charleston (S. C.) Mercury, says:

Webster is willing to be used this way to foil and frustrate those who have wounded him to the quick. He looks very badly, and seems to be breaking fast. He probably will not linger long after his great competitors who have recently passed away; and an almost prophetic sadness seems stamped upon his swarthy face, tempering its sullen gloom. It is a striking commentary on the end of ambition, and the emptiness of its rewards, to mark the last hours of these intellectual gladiators. Calhoun, with his ebbing breath, sadly and sternly prophesying the failure of his great efforts to avert coming evils from the land he loved. Clay, in his sick chamber, startled from the contemplation of his approaching change from time to eternity, by the shouts ratifying the nomination of the victorious chieftain, whose last triumph was over him and his will; and now Webster, like a caged eagle, fretting away his last remaining hours in indignant silence, and passing down to the land of shadows with a blacker shadow on his proud soul, and a store of bitter memories irradiated with no hope. For well does Webster know that, while his great competitors, he has touched on the Nation's pride and its intellect—never its heart. Few indeed are those who will mourn for Daniel Webster the man, while many weep for Calhoun and Clay—though all must acknowledge that a mighty spirit will be eclipsed, when the passing bell shall toll the requiem of that unquiet heart.

From the Knoxville Whig.
To the Whigs.

Previous to the nomination of Gen. Scott for the Presidency, as whigs, devoted to the Union, and the interests and rights of the South, we all declared our purpose not to support him, if he were elected, and many of us, with courage and bitterness, avowed our determination to stand by this pledge. After he was nominated, we did not seek to disguise our mortification that he was selected instead of Mr. Fillmore. Some of us have adhered to our pledges, and our devotion to principles, while others have been driven into lines, by the force of party drill, and the threats of designing and office seeking leaders.

To a man, the Southern Whigs yet believe, when in private they express their honest conviction, that the nomination of Scott was a Northern triumph over the South, whatever assertions Scott or his friends may make on the subject—however pertinaciously it may be contended that he is "a compromise man." Grant, for the sake of argument, that he is *per se*, not objectionable to Scott; the circumstances of his nomination—the fact that he is a Seward and Greeley candidate—was brought out by 66 Abolitionists, who bargained with an equal number of Southern delegates, to accept of their Platform if they would accept of their Man—this is ominous to the South; yea, it is portentous of evil, should he be elected. Let him succeed in November next, at the ballot-box, and from the day the election returns are in, the sectional strife between the North and South will commence, the notorious Seward, and Greeley, and other leading friends of theirs, have been for years, fomenting, and having as their great moving cause of action, overthrow of slavery in the Southern States. The election of Scott will bring the disaster and ruin, of the most fearful character, upon the country. This party would attempt the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, at the first session of Congress after Scott's election, and before his inauguration—and with the aid of Abolition democrats, enraged because of the defeat of Pierce, they would carry the measure—and this would and should be regarded, as a sufficient cause for the withdrawal of every Southern State from that Union. Mark our predictions!

THE WEBSTER ELECTORAL TICKET.—The Courier and Enquirer has just learned that the friends of Mr. Webster are really getting an electoral ticket and thinks that if the movement is persevered in the result will be most disastrous to the whig party. We can assure Col. Webb that the movement will be persevered in, but about its being disastrous to the whig party there is a difference of opinion. We think it will be the salvation of the whig party. It will save it from Sewardism, Greeleyism, abolitionism and higher lawism, any one of which would be its ruin.—N. Y. Day Book.

Position Defined.

Col. Toombs defined his position in a lengthy speech, (says the Columbus Times,) at Washington, Wilkes county, on the 7th inst. He stands yet with his Siamese twin brother Mr. Stephens. Mr. Webster he gave the best reasons why he should have taken Gen. Pierce. We gather this from the sketch of the speech given by the Washington Gazette; by no means a partial witness in favor of General Pierce. Here is what he said about Scott and Pierce. We copy from the Gazette, a Webster print:

"After reviewing the position of parties for the past two years, Mr. T. then spoke of the three candidates for the Presidency, now before the American people. He commenced with General Scott, showing most conclusively that he had no claims whatever upon his fellow-citizens for that responsible station. He spoke of him as a great General, admired his achievements in arms against the British, the Indians and the Mexicans, that he was the last one that would pluck a single laurel from his military fame. On this point Mr. Toombs was very eloquent, and paid a just tribute to him as a military chieftain, and that was all that could be said for him. Gen. Scott was the freesoil candidate—he was for the annexation of Canada—but not for any more slave territory—this Mr. T. was bitterly opposed to, and recommended all who thought it a moral duty to free their slaves; to vote for Scott."

"The Hon. Senator next reviewed the political course of General Pierce. He said nothing disparaging towards that gentleman, but on the contrary, spoke of him as a very consistent man in all his congressional career; that he had always acted with the South, and was the safest man (on the slavery question) North of Mason's and Dixon's line. We thought that Mr. T. lauded the democratic candidate too highly; for we believe there are many men North of that line as sound as Gen. Pierce. He preferred Pierce to Scott; but would not vote for either."

Letter from Hon. John P. Hale accepting the Free Soil Nomination for the Presidency.

Boston, Sept. 14.—Hon. John P. Hale, writing to Gen. Wilson, in reference to his nomination by the free-soilers to the Presidency, says: "I have not felt at liberty under the peculiar circumstances of the occasion, to set up my opinion in direct opposition to such an expression of my friends."

I therefore yield my own wishes and opinions to those of my friends, and thus assent to what has been done, notwithstanding my previous refusal to consent that it might be done.

I wish also to say to you, and through you to that portion of the public who may feel an interest in such matters, that to all inquiries which have been made of me, as well as to those which have already been made as to what my opinions are on various subjects, I have no answer to make."

M. W. Grand Lodge, of the State of Mississippi of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons:

The following resolution was adopted by the Grand Lodge in 1851:

Resolved, That this Grand Lodge recommend to all Lodges under its jurisdiction, that they celebrate in an appropriate manner, on the 4th day of November, 1852, the one hundredth anniversary of the receipt of the illustrious Washington into the Masonic fraternity.

And in January last, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That the Grand Secretary request the newspapers in this State, to publish the resolution adopted by this Grand Lodge at the last communication relating to the centennial celebration of the initiation of Washington, by the Subordinate Lodges."

The undersigned therefore, hereby respectfully requests the editors of newspapers in this State, to give this notice an insertion in their several papers.

WM. P. Mellen,
Grand Secretary.

Mr. Brownlow is a thorn in the flesh of Scottism. Hear him in reply the Whig Young Men's Committee of New York, asking his opinion of the canvass:

My honest "opinion of the canvass" is that if this State, it will result in favor of Pierce. I found this upon the belief that the Democratic party as a party, will vote for Pierce, while the whigs, as a whole, will not vote for Scott. The whigs have turned loose one or two insulting blackguards in each division of the State, who have denounced all who opposed the nomination of Scott, and read them out of the whig party and they are quite numerous. That portion of the whigs, who have any sense of honor or pride of character, will now refuse to come into the support of the ticket. Had their honest difference of opinion been respected, and had they been dealt kindly by, the result might have been otherwise. I have the honor to be, Your obedient servant,
W. G. BROWNLOW.

Miss Harriet Hosmer, a young woman of twenty years of age, residing at Watertown, Mass., has, it is said, recently produced a piece of sculpture in marble, which evinces talent of a high order, and promises to render her prominent as an artist. She calls the bust which she has completed "Hesper, the Evening Star."

It has the face of a lovely maiden gently falling asleep with the sound of distant music. Her hair is gracefully arranged, and entwined with capul of the poppy. A star shines on her forehead, and under her breast lies the crescent moon. The conception of the subject of the whole work was her own, men having been employed only to chop off some of the large pieces of marble, as the work was in progress. The bust was exhibited in Boston. Miss Hosmer proposes to visit Rome for a few years, with a view of becoming a sculptor by profession.

A sister of Gen. Scott, Mrs. Walker, resided in the vicinity of Richmond, Itawamba county, Mississippi. That has been her home for several years. The Whig and Democratic Electors called upon her, while canvassing that county, and paid their respects to her and her married daughters. Mrs. Walker is a widow, younger than Gen. Scott, in person about the medium size, exhibiting much of the vigor of life and health, and altogether a Virginia lady, "of the olden time." Her daughters are described as emphatically "fine looking ladies," of prepossessing appearance, agreeable manners, intellectual countenance, and tall and elegant figure. They bear in features and general appearance, striking traces of resemblance to the old hero.—Nash's Courier.

The Courier has neglected to tell its readers that the daughters of Mrs. Walker are married to democrats, and that their husbands, Fisher, Raymond and Priestly, will vote for Pierce and King.